

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Central Intelligence

SUBJECT : Inspector General's Comments on DD/I Progress Report
on ORR Survey

1. In compliance with your request, there follows my comments on the memoranda of Messrs. Amory and Guthe concerning the implementation of the ORR Survey of 7 June 1954.

2. Comments are as follows:

a. Section A. General, paragraph 2:

The Inspector General's findings were not based primarily on ORR's "tightening of control and insistence on assumption of responsibility" but were more concerned with symptoms of executive aloofness, failure of command communications and discriminatory personnel practices e.g., favorable toward economists at the expense of engineers, etc.

AD/RR states "the actions which caused initial discontent have now been recognized as valid and necessary." The initial discontent was not particularly brought about by the reorganization plans but by the inept execution of those plans by individuals who failed to carry out the changes with intelligence and due regard for the rights of human beings.

b. Section B. Specific, paragraph 1:

What evidence is there to support the statement that there has been greater acceptance of ORR reports in the last year?

c. Section B. Specific, paragraph 2:

The matter of ORR support to OCI will be specifically discussed in the forthcoming Report of Survey--OCI.

d. Section B. Specific, paragraph 3:

AD/RR mentions that the original deputy of the Economic Area was replaced in October 1954. My understanding is that this deputy is on one year detail to OO/C but remains on the ORR T/O.

~~SECRET~~

#2221

e. Section B. Specific, paragraph 4:

It is entirely unclear to me exactly what is the line of demarcation on the matter of reviewing manuscripts between the Planning Staff and the Publications Staff.

f. Section B. Specific, paragraph 7:

This paragraph says in part: "ORR continues to devote a modest effort to a review of production estimates, to insure that the figures supplied by the Air Force for national intelligence estimates are reasonably correct." By what right does ORR police the quality of the work of another IAC component? Doesn't the same apply to shipbuilding and the Navy?

g. Section B. Specific, paragraph 11:

AD/RR still fails to give any justification as to why ORR is doing research on Soviet civil defense. The question here is not how well they are doing this function but by what right.

h. Section B. Specific, paragraph 12:

25X1B4d

25X1A9a

25X1B4d

AD/RR states lesser utilization is being made of Professor and [REDACTED] for [REDACTED], but goes on to say "they will be called in from time to time on a much reduced basis, for the purpose of advising the AD on difficult problems not only of [REDACTED] but also of general economic research." (Underlining supplied). Is this a new problem?

25X1B4d

i. Section B. Specific, paragraph 18:

I thoroughly disagree with this reasoning. The U. S. Army which historically has much more experience in matters of organization than either DD/I or AD/RR has seen fit to establish the position of Assistant Division Commander, regardless of the fact that every assigned regiment in the Division has a regimental commander. The parallel between the Army Division and ORR is germane from an organizational point of view.

3. It should be pointed out that in the six months preceding the issuance of the ORR Survey, 7 June 1954, this staff handled eight individual cases arising from dissatisfied employees of that office. In the six months following the survey, ten such cases were handled. It would appear, therefore, that discontent and restlessness amongst ORR employees has neither been reduced nor eliminated.

Lyman B. Kirkpatrick
Inspector General